

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/783,458	02/19/2004	Sung-Kyu Kang	71990/RSM	7458	
7590 09/21/2005			EXAMINER		
Richard S. Milner			HRUSKOCI, PETER A		
Cooper & Dunh	am LLP				
1185 Avenue of the Americas			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10036			1724		
			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summany	10/783,458	_	KANG ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
The MAIL INC DATE of the control of the	Peter A. Hruskoo	_ 1	1724					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover	r sneet with the co	orrespondence ad	iaress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS CO 136(a). In no event, howed will apply and will expire te, cause the application to	OMMUNICATION ever, may a reply be tim SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONED	L. ely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 F	ebruary 2004.							
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consider							
Application Papers								
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b)□ obj	ected to by the E	xaminer.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held	in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•			• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	its have been rece its have been rece prity documents ha au (PCT Rule 17.2	eived. eived in Application ave been receive (a)).	on No d in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) 🔲	Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa Other:	te	O-152)				

Art Unit: 1724

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the specification on page 14 lines 16 and 21, and page 15 line 1 "conditioned coal", and page 15 line 1 "conditioned oil" appear to be misdescriptive since a conditioning step for the coal and oil does not appear to be disclosed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1 "passing ... sieve" appears to be misdescriptive because water from the sewage sludge and not the enlarged agglomerates passes through the sieve. In claim 1 "selectively separate them", in claim 3 "conditioned coal and oil", in claims 4 and 6 "conditioned coal with oil", and in claim 5 "conditioned coal and conditioned oil" are vague and indefinite because it is unclear how these terms further limit the claims. Claims 2, and 7-9 depend from the above claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki 3,933,634 in view of Bhattacharyya et al. 5,051,487 and Mikhlin et al. 4,874,393. Seki disclose (see col. 3 line 39 through col. 7 line 47) a method for dewatering sewage sludge substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Seki by reciting that oil is supplied to the sludge, and a sieve is used to separate the agglomerates. Bhattacharyya et al. disclose (see col. 2 lines 1-16, and col. 8

Art Unit: 1724

line 15 through col. 11 line 5) that it is known in the art to utilize emulsions including mineral oil, to aid in dewatering sewage sludge. Mikhlin et al. disclose (see col. 2 line 54 through col. 3 line 66) that it is known in the art to utilize a draining screen or sieve, to aid in dewatering coaloil agglomerates. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Seki by supplying oil and utilizing a sieve in view of the teachings of Bhattacharyya et al. and Mikhlin et al., to aid in dewatering the sewage sludge. With regard to claims 2, 4-7 and 9, it is submitted that Mikhlin et al. as applied above disclose that it is known in the art to utilize high and low speed stirring, first and second agglomeration steps, and the spray-washing of agglomerates, to aid in producing agglomerates used for fuel.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/783,458

Art Unit: 1724

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

9/19/05